DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 357 HE 005 175

AUTHOR	Wachman, Melvin
TITLE	The Urban Involvement of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	1 Mar 74
NOTE	9p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*City Problems; *Higher Education; *School Community Relationship; Speeches; *Urban Areas; *Urban Universities

ABSTRACT

Urban problems are enormously varied and they are related to every field of teaching and research in universities. There are few areas of liberal and professional training where the interests of the university and the needs of the city do not interrelate. It was to help answer these problems that the Urban Involvement of Higher Education Conference was held on March 1, 1974. This address from the conference is divided into 2 areas: the need for a new theoretical base for colleges and universities; and the relationship of the human make-up of education institutions to urban development. There are no institutions in the U. S. today that are closer to the total range of delivery systems--medicine, technology, associated health fields, law, communications, social work, education, recreation and culture--than the urban universities. For the university to be involved in the urban community, the institution must recognize the multifaceted character of the community and the types of training and education that it is capable of offering. In order to interface successfully with the urban community, the institution will need to strengthen relationships with city government. (Author/PG)

ED 087357

American Council on Education
Washington, D.C.
March 1, 1974

THE URBAN INVOLVEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Marvin Wachman
President, Temple University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The topic of this Conference is so vast and so significant that one may attack it from many different vantage points. I have chosen to direct my remarks to two large areas. I shall deal first with the need for a new or revised theoretical and practical base for our colleges and universities. Secondly, I will deal with the relationship of the human make-up of our educational institutions to our urban development.

In the fall of 1968, John W. Gardner addressed the Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education on the subject, "The University and the Cities." 1968 was, of course, a year of tremendous ferment in our cities and in our universities. It was the year of the chaos at Columbia University, the murder of Martin Luther King in Memphis, the assassination of Robert Kennedy in Los Angeles, and the débacle surrounding the national convention of the Democratic Party in Chicago.

Mr. Gardner said many things to the ACE members in his down-to-earth prose. He said, for instance:

> The colleges and universities of this country have not responded impressively to the urban crisis. They have been notably laggard. There is, of course, a great amount of activity going on in higher education that has the word "urban" attached. But many college leaders are not satisfied with the quality of those activities....Very few have pursued any aspect of the urban crisis with the intellectual rigor it requires. Even fewer have accepted the real world of the city on their doorstep as a laboratory in which they can advance those intellectual pursuits.

In the past five years colleges and universities have responded to the crisis of the cities to a much greater extent than was true before 1968. On the other hand, the sufficiency of that response is open to question, and any smugness about the contributions of higher education to the cities is misplaced.

The colleges and universities hardly have made a dent in the enormous problems of the cities; this is also true of other urban institutions and organizations. And yet, any president of an urban college or university can give examples of day-to-day services to the city and its citizens, and can demonstrate a deeper sensitivity and greater scope of activity than could possibly have been anticipated a decade ago.

There has been so much involvement that some academic people feel their schools should go slow. Universities, they believe, should be separate from the institutions surrounding them in order to continue their unhampered, critical search for truth. That may be a wise, cautionary approach, but it should be linked to the concept that the best education is related to the serious human and social issues confronting the community.

My thesis is neither new nor original. As Thomas Jefferson described his goal in writing the Preamble to the Declaration of Independence, we should get to "the common sense of the subject." "Involvement" is the key word in the topic of this Conference. I propose that we rethink our concept of higher education and restate in urban terms the land-grant college idea of the Nineteenth Century.

We are all familiar with the historical roots of support for American higher education, starting with the Ohio Company Contract of 1787, down through the work of Jonathan Baldwin Turner and Justin S. Morrill with the Land-Grant College Act of 1862. Many persons feel the Land-Grant College Act precipitated the most innovative period in the history of American higher education, from 1870 to 1910. During this benchmark time many of the great state institutions were created, with the College of Agriculture and its extension service as the prototypic innovation.

At the same time, the seeds were sown for the great urban campuses. The special needs of the emerging middle class of urban immigrants were forces which helped make possible the flowering of New York University, Boston University, City College, Temple University, and a host of sister schools.

In response to the pressures and needs of the larger society after the Civil War, a pluralistic system of higher education was forged. It rested upon the church-linked and "gentleman" élitist base that was present before the War. This diversity is still vital in our educational community today. The model for the brilliant, innovative period after the Civil War emerged from the successful welding of three sometimes conflicting goals of education: liberal learning, vocationalism and social utility, and scientific research. Each part of the triad had a "piece of the action" in this new pluralistic system.

The balanced, but uneasy, model worked well for a time. It received a major shot in the arm after the Second World War when the G.I. Bill pushed open much wider the doors of academia. Government support of research increased. And the flourishing economy produced more schools and colleges which were quickly filled with post-war babies. With these forces working for us, we moved into what, in retrospect, appears to some educators a veritable golden age, with more resources than we often knew what to do with.

Then came the Sixties. Revolutionary legislation like the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 were most significant in assisting higher education to meet the needs of the country. But there were signs that the old model was no longer working. At the federal level, major social changes emerged to put pressure on our key institutions, which in turn looked to us for help. But in education, in health care, economic and manpower development, and in the new frontiers of community and neighborhood, we were not effective in working with those key institutions, and we had little impact on the formulation of legislation. The ability to solve problems and to invent social programs to meet needs -- so vital in the old College of Agriculture model -- was missing.

After almost a century the pattern of public support in exchange for enlightened attention to the public interest was undone. Why? Although I leave it to our historians to provide a better answer, I believe there were two related factors. After several decades of having it all on our terms, we fell victim to the psychology of the seller's market. Secondly, the accelerating pace of social change simply found our early warning systems and response mechanisms inadequate.

What higher education needs for the final twenty-six years of this century is a new working model which reflects Barbara Ward's notion that we live on an "urban" planet. This model must relate to the real world of today and could well be based on the old land-grant concept, translated into the language and the needs of the world as it is now.

The idea of an urban-grant approach to contemporary higher education is not new. Clark Kerr was writing about it a decade ago. It is a model which must provide access to the non-traditional student, including urban youths, and persons seeking life-long education; face financial realities and the need for greater accountability in cost control; and most important, recognize the functional relationships between educational institutions and the publics served by them.

This updated model should proudly and openly recognize that the best teaching and research relates these two primary functions of higher education to the needs and aspirations of the broader community.

Let me give one example from my own institution of the kind of relationship I am talking about. Emerging in the "real" world via an Act of Congress is something called a developmental disabilities system. This system attempts to look at services to the retarded and handicapped in a total way. It brings together school systems, pediatric services, social agencies, residential training centers, families, community groups and neighborhoods.

My university took on the challenge of this new approach, as opposed to the "warehousing" approach of traditional institutions for the mentally and physically handicapped. We developed a program involving fourteen separate departments and six different colleges of the university aimed at improving the total system, including the operation of a residential school as a research, demonstration, and personnel training center. The time, energy and patience required has been enormous, but the effort illustrates what must be done to relate institutions of higher learning to the institutions of the larger society.

The relationship should be obvious. A College or Department of Education exists because there is a school system. A School of Business exists because of the needs of the regional economy. A Medical School and associated health schools exist because of the health care system. None of these units, be they in community college or university, would exist if the counterpart institution were not there, requiring trained manpower and intellectual services. There is a fundamental interrelatedness.

When I look at my own institution, I see a staggering array of activities directly relating us to urban problems: education of the disadvantaged and the handicapped; day-care and pre-school programs; better legal service to the poor; assistance to major corporations and minority businesses; police training in improved criminal justice education; human and social services for the entire metropolitan region; and major contributions to the area's cultural life.

There are no institutions in the United States today which are closer to the total range of delivery systems -- medicine, technology, associated health fields, law, communications, social work, education, recreation and culture -- than the urban universities. Yet, despite this, those of us in higher education do not have a coherent theory to describe the way we interrelate to society's problems, aspirations and delivery systems. In addition, we are often hesitant to advertise the connections openly and to serve openly and directly those institutions which need our assistance. Certainly, our rewards systems often go in the other direction.

Perhaps our inability to develop a new model of higher education reflects an unwillingness to turn away from the traditional approach to learning. Certainly, the belles-lettres approach to learning is part of one of the legs of the tripod upon which our present system was based, and it cannot be undervalued. Truth-seeking scholars are a major raison d'etre of the university. The traditional undergraduate liberal arts education must be retained in a proper balance with other types of education as the university strives to serve the needs of our urban nation. Indeed, I would argue that it should be deepened to provide a perspective for our problem-solving efforts.

But granted that the main goal of the American college or university is education and the creation of a learning environment, I believe that the best education must prepare for full participation in the larger society. An urban school must serve many needs. To be involved in the urban community, it must recognize the multifaceted character of the community and the types of training and education which it is capable of offering. There are obvious problems in implementing this approach. Let me illustrate my thesis in several particulars.

First, in order to interface successfully with the urban community, we need to strengthen our relationships with city governments. In the past, colleges and universities -- with the exception of city-sponsored schools -- have not done a good job of maintaining contacts with their cities. One problem is that many of us are state or state-related schools in the city.

Since we are so integral to the myriad delivery systems serving the urban population, we must deal more closely with municipal authorities. Yet, we have been wary of such ties because of the fear of losing autonomy. At the same time, the cities have not been especially comfortable about our involvement on the urban scene, either. Political systems thrive on patronage, and the people in City Hall get uneasy when persons outside the political system begin talking about meeting certain needs of a city's constituents. I do not think many persons in higher education have given much thought to this problem, but it is a part of the whole town-gown friction relocated to the city.

Another reason for the difficulty in cooperating with the city is that it is in deep fiscal trouble, too. But we cannot be divided from each other.

Another example of a critical problem for the urban university located in the city is health care.

Like terminal cancer patients, our hospitals are slowly dying, and no one is coming forth with a miracle drug.

The most serious problem of my administration at Temple is a mind-boggling accumulated debt at our hospital of $25 million. Much of it is the result of unreimbursed care to indigent patients from the ghetto of North Philadelphia. Health care of this kind is a public responsitility. It should not be the burden of university hospitals in the city. But the city of Philadelphia contributes only $200,000 to help cover indigent care. This figure lasts us about six weeks.

To continue to ask university hospitals to shoulder such an enormous fiscal burden is to guarantee their closing.

In this special area I have no suggestion except cooperation between city government, state welfare and health departments and the universities and hospitals in developing viable health education and health service systems with the aid of the federal government, the only taxing authority with the potential for the massive assistance necessary.

The "usefulness" notion I have been expounding does not extend to the ultimate end of universities committing suicide in order to provide free health care for those who should be covered by government programs. The universities are too important to the cities and their people to be permitted to be seriously weakened by a continual drain on their resources in the medical field.

In any case, the financial problems associated with providing health care, and the potential problems referred to earlier, must not deter us from developing the theoretical and practical base for close, productive relationships with the institutions of the cities in which we exist.

The second major topic of this paper concerns the human characteristics of our colleges and universities.

In specifying the urban involvement of higher education, we must discuss the changes in our student bodies. It is necessary to recognize realistically the changing profile of the cities. For a college or university to be "involved", its enrollment must represent the diverse ethnic and racial groups in the great urban areas. Equal access to the opportunities our educational institutions provide must be factual rather than theoretical. Thus, the urban challenge is as much a challenge in human relations as anything else. This challenge cannot be overemphasized. It may involve the need for greater accessibility for Chicanos and Puerto Ricans or new groups of white ethnics; or more likely, the need for greater representation of black students in our institutions. A little perspective on the matter of race and black enrollments may be in order.

As Lyndon Johnson put it, our black citizens were another nation in our midst -- at least until the last decade. The migration that began with the Second World War and continued into the following decades changed the nature of both cities and urban universities.

Urban colleges and universities were very slow to accommodate to the aspirations and needs of the newer residents of the metropolis.

In the spring of 1963, I was asked to address a special conference on "University and Community" under the auspices of the Association of Urban Universities. Not a single black institution was represented at that conference, and there were no black representatives from predominantly white institutions. At

that time the majority of the black enrollment in colleges and universities, which totalled between 150 and 200 thousand, appeared to be in the predominantly black institutions of the South, with very small percentages of black enrollments in urban institutions of the North even though the population of the northern cities was heavily black. In the same year, Howard and Meharry Medical Schools graduated 150 black M.D.'s; all the rest of the medical schools in the country produced 55 black graduates. But even that was an improvement over previous decades. Prior to 1948 not a single black medical student was enrolled in seventeen southern states and the District of Columbia except for those at Meharry and Howard. And there were only about 90 black students in 20 predominantly white schools of medicine in the North; the rest had none.

Also in 1963, the NEW YORK TIMES surveyed the job ranks of higher education and found that Harvard had no blacks in permanent tenure ranks, Columbia had no black full professors, and Yale had none at the professorial ranks at all. When John Hope Franklin went to Brooklyn College as chairman of the History Department in 1956 it was front page news in the NEW YORK TIMES. It was still front page news, albeit of the second section of the TIMES, in 1963, when he was appointed to a professorship at the University of Chicago.

We know that there has been a great change in black enrollment and black employment of administrative and professorial staff in the past five or six years. In 1968, for example, only two predominantly white institutions in the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges reported black enrollment of 5% or more. By the fall semester of 1972, there were 22 universities in this category. My own institution increased black enrollment by more than ten-fold in a decade, and the Medical School and Law School, among the professional schools, have enrolled more blacks in each of the last several years than they had previously in several years put together. By the fall of 1972 it was estimated that almost 9% of incoming freshmen across the country were black, with obviously a great portion of those students in colleges and universities catering to urban needs. Unfortunately, however, there are some recent indications that higher education is losing interest in meeting this need. In some areas, minority enrollments are beginning to decline.

The question of employment is another matter made difficult at the moment because of the leveling off of the student population and the shrinking of financial support to higher education. In both enrollment and employment, institutions wanting to be involved in urban challenges must retain a sense of urgency about this issue and not permit it to be obscured because of other pressures.

We have learned that admitting first generation minority students in substantial numbers calls for supportive services for these students to reduce their predictably high attrition rate. We must provide these students the best possible guidance so that they may complete their education and occupy productive roles in our society. Almost every institution I know which has undertaken to recruit academically and economically disadvantaged students has provided some type of support services. Unfortunately, the support is often insufficient to the need, and financial problems on the part of colleges and universities have made it more difficult to sustain the programs begun in the late 60's and early 70's, especially with

the shrinking of federal subsidies.

The recruitment and admission of disadvantaged students has forced a particular kind of turnabout for some of the urban institutions. My own university, for instance, was founded "primarily for the benefit of working men" by a Nineteenth Century visionary imbued with the American dream of upward mobility. Yet, in recent times the university shifted to a graduate school-research-PhD production emphasis. Other institutions in the cities also found themselves shifting in their balance toward such élitism. This kind of shift was supported by the cities, which saw federally subsidized research contracts providing employment and funds to aid their economies. The cities also determined that the redevelopment of slum areas could be accomplished by investing in a positive way in universities' development.

With the shift toward accenting professional and graduate schools, the question has been raised by faculty as to whether the university is able to do high-level scholarship and teaching, and still serve the heterogeneous student population, now including the sons and daughters of recent migrants from the rural South.

The answer to the question must be "yes." I refer back to the thesis of this paper, which is that the best teaching and research relates scholarship, and graduate and undergraduate education to the needs of society, and in this case to the needs of the city. If the educational and other human service delivery systems must be tied together for our institutions to be educationally meaningful, this strategy also enables us to get the necessary support for us to serve our varied student bodies.

My emphasis upon making our colleges and universities representative in order to reflect the population of the larger society is meant to be very strong. We can define our urban problems in very complicated ways and use the latest sociological jargon, but in the end the solutions come down to people. In 1974, in our cities and our suburbs, we are a people divided. And we suffer for these divisions. We are residents of fragmented metropolitan areas, and we shall remain in that unhappy condition until we change our outlook and attitudes about each other.

If our cities are ever going to get moving again, all of our citizens must find a way to sit down and talk about the problems we all face, and all groups must have a piece of the action.

This kind of human chemistry takes place every day at an urban institution of higher education. Drawing people from all kinds of religious, racial and economic backgrounds, the urban college and university is a key instrument for alleviating the class and ethnic fragmentation of our society. For any college or university to be involved in the urban crisis it must be involved on this basic human level, as well as on curricular and other complex issues.

To be fully involved in the great problems of our cities, a change in the climate on the campus is necessary. Higher education must actively sell itself to the public again, particularly in the face of the questioning of edu-

cation as the key to upward mobility by some of our own scholars. Also, we must reassert our role because of the loss of innocence (or should it be called naivete) about the possibilities of education, as well as the loss of faith in our work. To change the climate we will have to convince ourselves of the fruitful relationship between education and society while we also convince the citizens of the broader community. Also, we will have to convince ourselves and the community of the need to reflect a representative face to the outside world through our students and our staffs.

John Gardner wrote that "Every human institution stands in need of continuous renewal." That generalization holds true for the cities and for the colleges and universities as well.

The problems in our urban crisis are enormously varied and they are related to every field of teaching and research in the universities. There are few areas of liberal and professional training where the interests of the university and the needs of the city do not interrelate.

Our faculties and our institutions represent some of the finest intellect and technical expertise available anywhere. Often, the expertise is neither used within the university nor in the communities surrounding the university. Some years ago Walter Adams and John A. Garraty wrote a book called, Is the World Our Campus? In it they questioned the wisdom of many of the technical assistance programs in foreign countries which were managed by American universities. The implication of their questioning was that if that knowledge and ability is present, it should be used closer to home inside the university and in service to our own cities.

Changes in our pattern of competition with each other, moving toward inter-institutional cooperation, modifications of our internal rewards systems, and similar suggestions have been made so that we may direct energy and competence to identify the complexity of the problems and seek solutions to them. Also, it has been suggested that university representatives must aggressively seek out public officials and be willing to work with those in the city with whom they may not feel entirely comfortable, in order to learn to solve problems collaboratively and to serve in a positive manner.

If we do these things, academic institutions may be able to help pull our fragmented urban society together. If that is possible, our institutions will be assisting the entire nation to return to a sense of identity and mission in the remaining years of this century.

I believe we can solve some of the human and leadership problems before us in the cities today. In any case, we must make the attempt. In short, a breakthrough in the social psychology of our cities is necessary. Given the chance, the colleges and universities will assist in this breakthrough. We will do this by educating a large percentage of young people from all walks of life, representing all the groups in the great urban areas, and by actively associating ourselves with the solution of urban problems in the great cities of our country.

There are, of course, limits to what the universities can do. It is certain, however, that we can do much more than we have done, and that we must become more involved. We must do this because it is consistent with our educational aims, because it is right, and because it is necessary for our survival.